### 2AC—Elections Disad

#### No Uniqueness—

#### It’s too early to predict the election and there are many different “black swan” events that can happen between now and the election

#### Trump will win – prefer our ev – media and polls consistently underestimate his strengths.

MacLeod 5-27. [Andrew, visiting professor in the Policy Institute at Kings College London, "Donald Trump will win the US presidency by a landslide – don't underestimate him yet again" The Independent -- www.independent.co.uk/voices/donald-trump-will-win-the-us-presidency-by-a-landslide-dont-underestimate-him-yet-again-a7051686.html]

Right from Trump’s first days on the campaign trail, those opposing Trump have radically underestimated the threat. The Huffington Post even put him on its entertainment page. It did not analyse the opposition accurately, and the threat grew. Over the past few months, the media moved from treating him like a joke to assuming that he would “fall after Super Tuesday”. He didn’t. Then they claimed that his comments on abortion would put a stop to him. They didn’t. Later, losing Wisconsin was supposed to be a turning point – but it certainly wasn’t. Eventually it was assumed that Cruz and Kasich would team up and force a brokered Convention. They didn't, and Trump has won the Republican nomination. Now the media, having failed to learn its lesson, says Trump will be caught out by his tax affairs, or will fail to “get out the vote”, or that the polls show that both Sanders or Clinton could beat him. The underestimation continues, and ignores the fact that this November, Americans aren’t just voting on the president. They are voting for the Senate, the House, many local governors, judges, prosecutors, sheriffs. Even though dog-catchers are no longer elected, many municipal positions are. Republicans will turn out to vote for all the other offices. While there, they will be faced with the choice of holding their nose and voting for Trump, or, one presumes, Hillary Clinton. Democrats are kidding themselves if they think Republicans opposed to his candidacy won’t vote for Trump when it comes down to the wire. Consider this: in the 2008 North Carolina Democratic primaries, 38 per cent of Clinton’s supporters said they’d vote for John McCain over Barack Obama and 12 per cent said they would not vote at all. When election day came around, most shifted their view and voted for Obama. The same shift is happening within the GOP now. Trump’s approval rating is rising. Republican anti-Trump forces are retreating like Napoleon from Moscow, leaving bodies in their wake. Opponents such as Paul Ryan are casting around to find reasons to support Trump. Winning and losing elections in America is not about pinching votes from the other team. It is getting your team out to vote. In the US, voter turnout hasn’t exceeded 60 per cent for nearly 50 years. In 1968, 60.7 per cent of eligible voters actually managed to drag themselves out of bed and exercise a right that people had fought and died for. In 1996, less than 50 per cent bothered turning up. Getting out your own voters is far easier, and far more important, than pinching votes from the other side. In both 2008 and 2012, Obama ran a massive “get out the vote” campaign, inspiring many first time voters with the promise of hope, change and making history by electing the first black man to the White House. Voter turnout in 2008 was the highest since 1968. Clinton, on the other hand, does not inspire that level of emotion. The so called “woman card” that she plays is not motivating women either. In the Iowa caucus, only 14 per cent of women under 30 voted for Hillary; in New Hampshire it was around 10 per cent. Young women went for the 'old white guy' – Bernie Sanders. Trump is accused of having a “woman problem”, but so does Clinton. Both Clinton and Trump are widely unpopular, but Trump has one advantage: he is inspiring first-time voters to turn out on polling day. Trump is gaining votes in the "rust belt" from people who would not normally vote Republican, or even vote at all. A recent poll even had Trump him behind Clinton, by only 0.3 per cent. His momentum is upward. Do you see where this is heading? Clinton will get fewer votes than Obama. Trump will get out far more first-time voters than the Republicans have ever achieved before, while regular Republican voters will hold their noses and punt for Trump. Unless the left stop dreaming up reasons for Trump to lose, and start campaigning like he might win, the 2016 election will be the landslide for Trump.

#### Clinton isn’t tied to the plan AND the GOP can’t spin against her

Golan 15 (Shahar, Henry M. Jackson School of Int’l Studies at University of Washington – Chaired by Sorenson - Director Center for Korea Studies, Building a Pragmatic Coalition in American Politics, Rethinking United States Military Bases in East Asia, University of Washington, The Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, Task Force - Winter 2015, <https://digital.lib.washington.edu/researchworks/bitstream/handle/1773/33275/Task%20Force%20E%202015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>)

As a recent Washington Post op-ed bluntly pointed out, “If Hillary Clinton wants the nomination — and there’s no indication to the contrary — she can have it” (Robinson, 2015, n.p.). Hillary’s nomination will make it very difficult for the Republican Party to attack the Democrats for going soft on China by spinning the rethink of the military bases to seem that way. The former First Lady’s reputation in foreign policy circles is difficult to challenge. She recently distanced herself from Obama’s foreign policy generally, from Asia policy specifically, and is perceived as a foreign policy hawk. In the New York Times review of her book Hard Choices, Michiko Kakutani (2014) stated that “Mrs. Clinton’s views are perceived as often more hawkish than Mr. Obama’s” (n.p.). Another book review in The Guardian also articulated opinions attuned with the New York Times article and public perception, stating “she comes across as consistently hawkish, pushing Obama to take stronger action” (Runicman, 2014, n.p.). Many in the defense establishment including former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates have praised Clinton for her diplomatic skills. Her experience in foreign relations and her perception as a foreign policy hawk will challenge Republicans as they look ahead towards the upcoming presidential elections. Accusations of a foreign policy rethink favoring soft policies on the PRC and the DPRK will most likely fall flat for the Republican Party against this seasoned diplomat.

#### Single issues can’t change votes – opinions are crystallized.

**Sabato 3-26**. [Larry, UVA Center for Politics Director, "Why htis scandal won't hurt Hillary" Sabato's Crystal Ball -- www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/]

Nevertheless, there is good reason to think that scandal has a much less pronounced effect at the presidential level. For one thing, most elections for the White House revolve around macro-issues such as the economy and war, and voters instinctively realize that personal peccadilloes fade in importance. For another, most top-tier contenders are reasonably well known and have been vetted to some degree by the press and opponents in prior elections. When voters already have a clearly formed view of a candidate and his or her strengths and weaknesses, it naturally becomes more difficult to alter impressions.∂ For no one is this more true than Hillary Clinton, who has been in the national spotlight, center stage, for 23 years. HuffPost Pollster data show over 90% of the public has already formed an opinion of Clinton, the most of any potential 2016 candidate. Other than the very youngest voters, is there really anyone left who doesn’t have a mostly fixed view of her?∂ You can argue that, to a lesser degree, the same is true for Jeb Bush. Americans outside of Florida may not know Jeb well, but they are very familiar with the Bush family. While Jeb doesn’t like it and is already struggling against it, voters attribute many of his family’s traits to him.∂ Jeb is insisting he’s his own man, yet it will be nearly impossible to insulate him from the deep recessions and Middle East wars of his father and brother. With the good that derives directly from being a Bush (instant name recognition, establishment support, tons of campaign cash) comes the unavoidable bad of the Iraq War, the response to Hurricane Katrina, and economic near-collapse.∂ Think of it this way: Both Clinton and Bush enter the campaign cycle with a million pixel image in the voters’ minds. If you add a couple thousand new pixels to the picture, the overall image doesn’t change much. A garden-variety scandal — and maybe an entire campaign full of them — won’t transform the projection on the screen.

#### China policy doesn’t cause people to switch votes—domestic issues matter more and the GOP centers their agenda around it.

#### Trump’s agenda will go nowhere – Congress checks.

Ferguson 5-8-16. [Niall, professor of history at Harvard and a senior fellow of the Hoover Institution at Stanford, "Keep calm — the Constitution will constrain Trump" Boston Globe -- https://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2016/05/08/keep-calm-constitution-will-constrain-trump/vb06y2Q2O5khvkZKdHl7pI/story.html]

The only half-decent argument for keeping calm is that the Constitution was purpose-built to constrain a man like Trump. To see why the separation of powers still matters, just consider what Trump says he is going to do if he wins. By the end of his first 100 days as president, Trump assured The New York Times recently, his wall along the Mexican border would be designed and his blanket ban on Muslim immigration would be in place. On Day 1, those American companies that have the temerity to employ people abroad would be threatened with punitive fines. Finally, Trump would impose an across-the-board tariff on Chinese imports. “We can’t continue to allow China to rape our country,” he declared at a rally last weekend. Now for the good news. He can do almost none of this if Congress opposes him. According to the Constitution (Article I, Section 8), it is not the president but Congress that has the power to regulate immigration, taxation, and trade. The president’s principal power lies in his being commander in chief of the armed forces. Even his right to make treaties is conditional on “the advice and consent” of the Senate. In short, the Donald’s antiglobalization program depends on his being able to muster majorities in Congress. How easy is that going to be when the speaker of the House — a Republican — can’t bring himself to endorse Trump and the Democrats stand a good chance of retaking the Senate?

#### Long timeframe for warming impacts and adaptation solves

Mendelsohn 9 (Robert, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf)

The heart of the debate about climate change comes from a number of warnings from scientists and others that give the impression that human-induced climate change is an immediate threat to society (IPCC 2007a,b; Stern 2006). Millions of people might be vulnerable to health effects (IPCC 2007b), crop production might fall in the low latitudes (IPCC 2007b), water supplies might dwindle (IPCC 2007b), precipitation might fall in arid regions (IPCC 2007b), extreme events will grow exponentially (Stern 2006), and between 20–30 percent of species will risk extinction (IPCC 2007b). Even worse, there may be catastrophic events such as the melting of Greenland or Antarctic ice sheets causing severe sea level rise, which would inundate hundreds of millions of people (Dasgupta et al. 2009). Proponents argue there is no time to waste. Unless greenhouse gases are cut dramatically today, economic growth and well‐being may be at risk (Stern 2006). These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.